

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 233 865

RC 014 302

**AUTHOR** Iadicola, Peter  
**TITLE** School Characteristics and Assimilation; The Dilemma of Desegregation Revisited.  
**INSTITUTION** Indiana Univ., Fort Wayne.  
**SPONS AGENCY** National Inst. of Mental Health (DHEW), Rockville, Md.  
**PUB DATE** Jan 80  
**GRANT** MH-26607-03  
**NOTE** 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Society for the Study of Social Problems Meeting (New York, NY, August 1980).  
**PUB TYPE** Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)  
**EDRS PRICE** MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.  
**DESCRIPTORS** \*Acculturation; Anglo Americans; \*Cultural Pluralism; \*Educational Environment; Educational Resources; Elementary Education; Ethnicity; \*Hispanic Americans; Institutional Characteristics; Power Structure; Research Methodology; \*School Desegregation; Sex Differences; \*Socioeconomic Status; Student Attitudes  
**IDENTIFIERS** California

**ABSTRACT**

School environments conducive to equal status relations appear counter-productive to assimilation, according to a study of the relationship between school status characteristics and assimilation levels achieved by Hispanic sixth graders. A prior study provided data for this research from 10 desegregated elementary schools in California regarding peer group contextual factors (percent Anglo, school socioeconomic status), resegregation processes (levels of norm-referenced testing, grouping, classroom competition, school busing differences), and multicultural modeling processes (multicultural curriculum; cultural differences in school resources, staff power, and parent power). The study also provided data regarding three indicators of assimilation: ethnic salience, ethnic self-attitudes, and attitudes toward other ethnic groups. Results indicated that peer group contextual factors were important to assimilation: the higher the percent Anglo and the school's socioeconomic status, the lower the level of favorable ethnic self-attitudes. Resegregation processes were highly significant correlates of status inequality between Anglo and Hispanic students, especially Hispanic females, and all resegregation processes were significantly correlated with at least one assimilation indicator. The multicultural modeling processes were only significantly correlated with ethnic salience and self-attitude. Overall, the two goals of desegregation appeared incongruent. Reassessment of desegregation goals is necessary because of changing political forces in minority communities. (SB)

ED233865



SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS AND ASSIMILATION;  
THE DILEMMA OF DESEGREGATION REVISITED \*

by

Peter Iadicola

Indiana University  
Fort Wayne, Indiana

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Peter Iadicola*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

January, 1980

Research findings reported in this paper were supported by Public Health Service Research Grant No. MH 26607-03 from the National Institute of Mental Health, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The opinions and conclusions stated in this paper are not to be construed as officially reflecting the policy of the granting agency.

\*Presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, August 1980, New York, New York

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.  
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

\* Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

RC 014302

## SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS AND ASSIMILATION: THE DILEMMA OF DESEGREGATION REVISITED

The paper presents research on the relationship between school characteristics, which are related to status inequality between Hispanic and Anglo students, and levels of assimilation Hispanic students achieve. Specifically, the paper examines the relationship of (1) peer group contextual factors (percent Anglo and socioeconomic status of the school), (2) resegregation processes (levels of norm referenced testing, grouping, classroom competition, and school busing differences), and (3) multicultural modeling processes (multicultural curriculum, differences in school resources allocated to Anglo and Hispanic, differences in staff power between Anglo and Hispanic staff, and differences in parent power between Anglo and Hispanic parents) to the level of assimilation Hispanic sixth grade students achieve. There are three indicators of assimilation incorporated in the study: ethnic salience, attitudes toward own ethnic group, and attitudes toward other ethnic groups.

The hypotheses are based on the author's past research which explores the relationship between the two policy goals of desegregation; assimilation and improvement in intergroup relations through equal status relations. If the two goals of desegregation are congruent, meaning that one is able to achieve both goals within the school, then there either will be no relationship between those school factors which are related to status inequality and levels of assimilation, or that those same factors which are related to status inequality are related in such a way that they do not obstruct the assimilation process in the school. On the other hand, if the two goals are incongruent the relationships between the school characteristics and the level of assimilation should be just the opposite of the latter pattern, a school environment which is conducive to equal status relations is counter-productive to achieving assimilation in the school.

The relationships are tested with a sample of 10 schools (118 Hispanic sixth grade students). School level process variables are assigned to the individual student and the analysis is conducted on the individual student level. The mode of analysis is correlational. Problems of multicollinearity prohibit partitioning of the variance via a regression analysis. Nevertheless, the general pattern of results indicate an incongruence between the two goals of desegregation. A school environment which is conducive to equal status relations in the school appears to be counter productive for the accomplishment of assimilation. The paper ends with a discussion of a need to reassess the goals of desegregation in light of the changing political forces in minority communities.

School Characteristics and Assimilation;  
The Dilemma of Desegregation Revisited

In the social science literature there are two goals attributed to the policy of desegregation; assimilation and improvement in intergroup relations through the reduction of prejudice (Iadicola and Moore, 1979). In, 1961, former Harvard University president James Conant recommended improved schooling for the black child to overcome the "adverse" influence of the home and the street. Busing black students to schools outside the slums to bring them in contact with white classmates was the method recommended to prepare them for entrance into middle class society and to motivate them to discard their black and lower class culture (Carlson, 1975:136). Stuart Alsop (1968:92), a well known and respected columnist, succinctly expresses the goal of assimilation.

An enormous educational effort, starting as early as the second year of life, will have to be made if the children of the Negro immigrant, like the children of other immigrants before them, are to become Americans first and Afro-Americans only second.

Iannacone (1977) notes that by the courts decision in the Brown vs. Board of Education case, that separate is not equal, they took a position consistent with the unitary community view of the progressive period, an assimilationist position. Iannacone concludes that the court's ruling carried the doctrine of progressivism to its inevitable conclusion.

Gerard and Miller (1975:15-20) note eleven theoretical assumptions of the policy of desegregation which are consistent with the goal of assimilation;

1. The achievement gap is not due to differences in native ability between black and whites.

2. The educational gap is due to a difference in orientation toward education attainment within the black and white communities...  
White values stress academic achievement more than do black values.
3. Achievement orientation deficits are reversable and are easier to reverse the younger the child.
4. Social influence will occur in any group, so that the norms of conduct, beliefs, values of the majority will influence the minority.
5. There are no strong barriers to communication... This assumption implies that there is a fluid social structure in the classroom, that the racial subgroups will not segregate themselves into work and friendship cliques.
6. Salutory effects will also be mediated by teacher's influences, which will tend to normalize achievement in the classroom.
7. Competition is good and will lead to improved performance.
8. If the performance standard for a person is raised, he will improve in order to meet the new standard. In order for this to occur, however, the person must be motivated to reach the new standard and not have to exceed his grasp.
9. Teachers will treat children similarly regardless of ethnic background.
10. Desegregation will increase the minority child's self-esteem.
11. Increased self-esteem will lead to increased achievement.

Gerard and Miller (1975) contend that these assumptions are made implicit or explicit in the three processes outlined within the policy of desegregation. The first process they discuss is that the child will raise his level of aspirations by virtue of a presumably more advanced curriculum and the higher standards imposed within the desegregated classroom. The authors note that

the second process detailed by the policy involves the lateral transmission of values. This transfer of values is necessary if the child is to have the "correct" cultural disposition to achieve in the system. This second process is the keystone for the assimilationist foundation of the policy. The third process discussed specifies a positive effect upon the minority group child's self esteem, as a result of the belief that he is being treated in the same way as are the majority children, a feeling of acceptance into the majority group. The success of the assimilation effort will be evidenced in the decreasing achievement differentials between minority and dominant Anglo populations.

The second major goal of desegregation is the reduction of racial prejudice through contacts between students. Allport (1954) concludes that only equal status contact improves intergroup relations by leading to the perception of common interests and common humanity. The following premises are derived from Allport's work: (1) Desegregation is a prerequisite to contact and acquaintance. (2) Equal status contact among students, staff, and parents of various racial/ethnic groups in desegregated schools will reduce prejudice. (3) Equal status contact in schools is enhanced when (a) equal status contact is sanctioned by explicit school policy, (b) students, staff, and parents of various racial/ethnic groups work together, (c) the school program emphasized the common interests and common humanity of persons of all racial/ethnic groups. Gerard and Miller (1975) list the elimination of prejudice, as outlined in the fifth assumption, as preceding the accomplishment of assimilation. Thus, theoretically, equal status contacts must precede the transmission of majority cultural values.

In an earlier paper, I discussed how the goal of assimilation is accomplished in the desegregated elementary school (Iadicola, 1977). In that paper the process of assimilation was divided into two parts: structural assimilation and cultural

assimilation. Structural assimilation according to Gordon (1961) involves the large scale entrance into cliques, clubs, and institutions of the dominant group on a primary group level. In terms of the elementary school, entrance into the Anglo peer group was defined as structural assimilation. Cultural assimilation is defined as the incorporation of the cultural values, attitudes, and behavioral norms of the dominant group (Gordon, 1961). For the elementary school, the level of cultural assimilation minority students attain is reflected in their grade point average. Those students who conform to the teacher's behavioral expectations are rewarded for this conforming behavior through higher grades. This theoretical model of the desegregated school as an agency of assimilation was tested using a sample of Hispanic sixth grade students.

Generally, it was discovered that those Hispanic students who are more culturally assimilated into the Anglo core culture, as measured by academic G.P.A. are more attitudinally ethnic outgroup oriented (reflecting a high level of assimilation) than those who were less culturally assimilated. This relationship was direct in the case of the Hispanic male; however, it operated indirectly through structural assimilation for the Hispanic female. Hispanic female students who are more attitudinally outgroup oriented were accepted by Anglo peers at higher rates (structural assimilation) and this then was positively related to their academic performance (cultural assimilation) (Iadicola, 1977).

In a subsequent paper the issue was the second goal of desegregation, improvement in intergroup relations through equal status contacts (Iadicola and Moore, 1979). The topic addressed was the relationship between the peer group contextual factors percent Anglo and socioeconomic status upon status relations in desegregated schools. In accordance with the contact hypothesis, as outlined by Allport (1954), only through equal status contacts will there

be improvement in intergroup relations and the reduction of prejudice. The central question was whether one could accomplish the second goal of desegregation, improvement in intergroup relations through equal status relations, in an environment which is conducive to the accomplishment of the goal of assimilation. In other words, how does an Anglo dominated and high SES environment effect status relations between Anglo and minority students. The results indicated that for Black male sixth grade students the status differences between themselves and Anglo male students increase as the percent Anglo in the school increases. For the Hispanic female students, the higher the socioeconomic status of the student population in a school, the greater the level of status inequality they experience in their relations with Anglo female students. The results were not statistically significant for Hispanic male or Black female students. However, it is important to note that both these specific subgroups experienced lower levels of status inequality than their ethnic group counterparts in the 13 schools studied.

This was the dilemma of school desegregation as defined in this earlier paper. How could one accomplish the policy goal of improvement in intergroup relations through equal status contacts in an environment which is conducive to assimilation. In the conclusion of this paper, a theoretical model developed by Mercer, Iadicola and Moore (1979) was discussed as leading to a possible solution to the dilemma. In this theoretical model, several school processes are hypothesized to effect the status relations among students in desegregated schools: testing and grouping practices, level of classroom competition, busing differences between minority and majority students, multicultural curriculum, resource differences, and power differences between Anglo and minority parents and staff. By the manipulation of these school processes it is hypothesized that one is able to achieve equal status relations between Anglo and minority elementary school students.

In one examination of the model, resegregation processes (norm referenced testing, classroom grouping, classroom competition, and busing differences) were investigated for their effect upon status differences between Anglo and Hispanic students (Moore and Iadicola, 1979). The results of this research indicated that for the Hispanic male only the level of classroom competition is significantly correlated with Anglo-Hispanic status relations. As the level of classroom competition increases in the school, the higher the level of status inequality Hispanic male students experience in their relations with Anglo male students. On the other hand, the Hispanic female student's level of status inequality was not effected by the level of classroom competition in the school. However, testing, grouping, and busing all had highly significant correlations for the Hispanic female's status relations with Anglo female students. The higher the level of testing, group, and busing differences in the schools the greater the level of Anglo/Hispanic status inequality exhibited.

Another examination of the model concerned the relationship between the multicultural modeling processes (multicultural curriculum, school resource distribution, and staff and parent power differences) upon status relations between Anglo and Hispanic and Anglo and Black students (Iadicola and Moore, 1980). For the Black male and female subsamples, multicultural curriculum and parent and staff power differences were significantly correlated with status differences between Black and Anglo students in desegregated schools. Generally, the results with the Hispanic sample were not as strong as those found with the Black sample. Only the absolute level of Hispanic resources and parent power differences were significantly correlated with status differences for the Hispanic female. The results for the Hispanic male were generally inconsistent.

Overall, the results from the research investigating the model by Mercer, Iadicola and Moore (1980) suggests that possibly by manipulating those school processes which were found to be significant correlates, one may be able to alter the status inequality produced by an Anglo, high socioeconomic status dominated student environment. The question posed in the conclusion of this most recent test of the model (Iadicola and Moore, 1980) is how do these same school processes affect the school's ability to accomplish the first goal of desegregation, assimilation. By manipulating the school environment in terms of these processes, will we be moving in a direction which is counter to the achievement of the goal of assimilation? It may be that only in an environment of status inequality can assimilation be achieved.

The present paper investigates the relations between these same school processes upon the level of assimilation Hispanic students achieve in the elementary school. If an environment which is conducive to equal status relations is counter productive to assimilation, we would expect that the less norm referenced testing, grouping, classroom competition, Hispanic bus-ing (absolutely and relatively), percent Anglo, socioeconomic status of the school, and the more Hispanic resources (absolutely and relatively), Hispanic staff and parent influence (both absolutely and relatively) in a school, the lower the level of assimilation Hispanic students would attain. If we could achieve assimilation together with equal status relations in the same setting, we would hypothesize that the resegregation and multicultural modeling processes would have no relation or may reinforce the level of assimilation Hispanic students attain in the school.

## Design

*Sample*

Data is derived from a study of thirteen desegregated elementary schools in California. These thirteen schools were selected from a 1973-1974 sample of 182 desegregated schools for which profiles were available on student academic and mental health outcomes. Rank orders were composed from the standardized residual scores on these variables for each school for ethnic minority student groups. Seven schools with more positive outcomes for minorities were selected, as well as six schools with more negative outcomes for minority students.

Information for the present study was obtained through interviews with school administrators, tabulations from school files, observation of classrooms, and student and teacher questionnaires. All of the teachers in the thirteen schools were asked to complete the questionnaires on school processes, and 177 of 188 teachers returned completed questionnaires. The actual sample used in this paper includes only those schools in which there existed a Hispanic population. A total of ten schools yielded a sample of 102 Anglo and 118 Hispanic students (for more sample information see Iadicola and Moore, 1979).

*Operationalizations:**Percent Anglo and Socioeconomic Status of the School*

The percent Anglo in the school was obtained from the schools' records. The range of scores for the ten schools was 21% to 86% Anglo. The mean of the ten schools is 53.62%, standard deviation is 23.02. The school level measure of socioeconomic status was derived from two sources of data; (1) sixth grade teachers' rating of occupation of the fathers of each of the students attending their classes and (2) the percent of students of each ethnic group enrolled in the sixth grade. These SES ratings were based on a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 for

unemployed or on welfare, 1 for unskilled laborers, 2 for skilled laborers or tradesmen, 3 for clerical workers, 4 for managerial positions, and 5 for professional positions. SES scores for parents of individual students from each ethnic group attending the sixth grade were summed, averaged, and then standardized against a sample of 10,000 students from 174 desegregated schools involved in an earlier study (Mercer and Nickles, 1974). A single school-level score was computed from the standardized SES scores assigned to each ethnic group, as follows: Anglo SES score  $\times$  (percent Anglo students enrolled  $\div$  100, etc.) and then summed across all groups. The scoring range is 27.30 to 58.44. A higher score represents a higher socioeconomic status of the parents of students in the school.

#### *Testing*

A school-level measure of the "testing" process was derived for each school in the study from four sources of data: (1) the number of IQ test scores (both group and individual) recorded in each student's cumulative school file, (2) the percentage of grade levels in each school reported as giving IQ tests, (3) the percentage of grade levels reported as giving achievement tests, and (4) the percentage of students referred and tested compared to the total number of students in the school.

A composite score for each individual sample students in the school was calculated by summing the number of IQ tests on the student's CUM files, the maximum score is 5 (Scores were weighted by 20 to make it the equivalent unit as the other measures), the percentage of grades giving IQ tests, the percentage of grades giving achievement tests, and the percentage of students referred for testing. A school level measure of testing was computed by averaging the summer scores of the sample students in that particular school. The scoring range is 48 to 124, with a higher score representing a higher level of norm-referenced testing in the school.

### *Grouping*

The process of classroom grouping is measured at the school level from two sources of data: (1) the teachers' "yes" or "no" responses to a six-item scale about their own grouping practices and (2) the observers' "yes" or "no" responses to a five-item scale asking about their observations of classroom grouping during class sessions (reliability of the subscales is .54, Cronbach's Alpha). The individual teachers' and observers' scores were summed and an average score calculated for each school. The scoring range is 2.68 to 5.92 for the 10 schools, with a higher score representing a higher incidence of classroom grouping.

### *Competition*

A school-level measure of classroom competition was derived from a three item scale responded to by the classroom observers. "Yes" or "no" responses were gathered on items concerning the posting of individual student grades by the teachers, the encouragement of cooperative student tutoring and the use of contests in academic subject. The questions were then summed for each classroom and the averages calculated for a school-level measure (reliability, .46, Cronbach's Alpha). The scoring range is 4. to 5.83. A high score indicates less competition in the school's classrooms.

### *Burden of Busing*

A school-level measure of the process "burden of busing" was derived for students of both ethnic groups attending a particular school from three sources of data: (1) the number of minutes each individual who was bused spend riding on the bus from home to school, (2) the number of students in each ethnic group enrolled in the school, and (3) the number of students of each ethnic group who were bused. The time that each student of each ethnic group spent riding the bus

was summed and then averaged. An index of busing was derived separately for Hispanics and Anglos by multiplying the average time that students of each group were bused by the percent of the enrollment of that ethnic group who were bused. The scoring range for Hispanic students' index of busing is from 0 to 2314, a high score indicates a high level of Hispanic busing.

A difference score representing the inequities in the burden of busing between the two ethnic groups of students was calculated for each school by subtracting the index of busing score for Anglo students from that of Hispanic students. The scoring range for Hispanic minus Anglo busing differences is -831 to 1664. A higher positive score represents a greater burden of busing for minority students.

#### *Multicultural Curriculum*

The measure of Hispanic multicultural curriculum was derived from eight sources of data: (1) the school average of teacher's reports of multicultural curriculum use in their classrooms, calculated from an eleven-item scale (reliability .81, Cronbach's Alpha); (2) the school average of teacher's reports of ethnic holiday recognition in their classrooms; (3) the school average of teacher's reports of use of multicultural materials in their classroom, calculated from responses to a list of twenty-seven book titles which were selected by the State Department of Education of the State of California as multicultural books to be used in the classroom; (4) the average number of books on the Hispanic culture in the school's classroom, as indicated by classroom observers; (5) the average number of materials, other than books, on the Hispanic culture in the school's classrooms; (6) the number of items in displays on the school's bulletin boards dealing with the Hispanic culture, as indicated by classroom observer's reports; (7) the percent of books in the school's library on the Hispanic culture, as indicated by classroom observers; (8) the percent of

materials, other than books, in the school's library on Hispanic culture. The indicators were weighted to make each equivalent and then summed into a scale measuring the level of Hispanic multicultural curriculum. The scoring range is 19 to 32 for Hispanic multicultural curriculum. A higher score represents a higher level of Hispanic multicultural curriculum in the school.

#### *Access to Resources*

A school-level measure of the process "access to resources" was derived for sample students of each ethnic group attending a particular school in the study from two basic sources of data: (1) a list of the special programs outside of the regular curriculum in which each individual student was enrolled and (2) the number of minutes per week each student spent attending each program. A score for total time in special programs was calculated for each student by adding the minutes he or she spent in each of the programs. A school-level score was then derived for each ethnic group by averaging the summed total scores of each student of that group, scoring range for Hispanic students: 0 to 847.5. A difference score representing the level of Anglo dominance in time spent in special programs was also calculated by subtracting the average time spent by Hispanic students from the average time by Anglo student, scoring range -124.17 to 49.09.

#### *Parent Influence*

A school-level measure of the process "parent influence" was derived for parents of students of each ethnic group attending a particular school in the study from three basic sources of data: (1) a teacher rating on a three-item scale (5 point semantic differentials): Makes demands on school/Does not make demands on school, Powerful in the community/Not powerful in the

community, Able to influence school policy/Not able to influence school policy. The reliabilities of the teacher ratings were .54 (Cronbach's Alpha) for ratings of Anglo parents and .62 for Hispanic parents. (2) The second source of data was from the interviewer/observer information regarding the percent of the parents of each ethnic group in the power structure: in positions in the P.T.A., on parent advisory boards, and as homeroom mothers. (3) The third piece of information was the percent of volunteers of each ethnic group. Scores for the three measures were weighted to make each indicator equivalent in the formula, and then summed. Scoring range is 38 to 131, a high score indicates a high level of parent influence. Difference scores were also calculated for Anglo/Hispanic influence differences. Hispanic parent influence was subtracted from the Anglo parent influence in each school to provide an indication of the level of power differences between the two groups. Scoring range is 09 to 233, high score indicates Anglo parent dominance.

#### *Staff Influence*

A school-level measure of the process "staff influence" was derived for staff persons of each ethnic group serving in a particular school in the study from four basic points of information: (1) a list of all persons on the school's paid staff, (2) their position in the staff hierarchy, (3) whether they were part-time or full-time, and (4) their ethnic group. Each position held by a staff member was scored either as: classified staff, 1; paraprofessional, 2; teacher, 3; specialist, 4; or administrator, 5. This score was multiplied by 1 for a full-time position, .5 for a part-time position. Individual scores were then summed to obtain a single score representing total staff influence according to hierarchy and amount employed. An index of staff influence for each ethnic group was derived by

summing the position score of the staff members of each particular ethnic group serving in the school and then calculating the percentage this score was of the total score for the school. Scoring range is 0 to 34, high score indicates a high level of Hispanic staff influence. A difference score representing the inequality in positions of influence between staff members of the various ethnic groups in each school was also calculated by subtracting the index of staff influence for Hispanic staff members from that of Anglo staff members. Scoring range is 26 to 94, high score indicates high Anglo staff dominance.

#### *Indicators of Assimilation*

Three indicators of assimilation are included in the analysis: ethnic salience, attitudes toward own ethnic group, and attitudes toward other ethnic groups. Ethnic salience was measured by a single question asked on the student questionnaire. Students were asked to pretend they were describing themselves over the telephone to someone who did not know them. A column of eleven lines beginning "I am \_\_\_\_" was provided. Students responded by writing in single word descriptors or descriptive statements on the lines. Ethnic group descriptors; Black, Mexican, brown, etc. were scored by rank order of presentation down the lines, from 0 for not mentioned to 11 for mentioned first. Scores were then summed, a high score indicated a high level of ethnic salience in how the students described themselves.

Both attitudes toward own ethnic group and attitudes toward other ethnic group were derived from a factor analyzed subset of questions asked of the students who attended a Pegasus game session (Iadicola and Moore, 1979a). Students were told that they were going to see a series of pictures of school children for a brief period of time, and that after they had a chance to see the pictures, they were going to be asked questions about them. They were told that they would

see the pictures once, so to look carefully. They then observed a group of nine, 8 X 10 photographs of children in general school settings (classroom, school yard, bus stop, etc.) which were pasted on a 3 ft. x 4 ft. piece of white cardboard. The cardboard was held up for them to see for approximately 20 seconds. The students were then given a set of drawings of the faces of a boy and a girl of each ethnic group, Anglo, Black, Hispanic. The students were told that these were some of the children they saw in the pictures and that they were going to be asked some questions about them. Each drawing was labeled with a child's name, Jane and Scott (were the names of the Anglo children), Pearl and Willie (for the Black children), and Maria and Juan (for the Hispanic children). Students were then asked to respond to the following statements and questions:

Some of the girls wore dirty clothes.

Some of the girls were helping a smaller kid who had fallen off the swings.

Some girls were causing trouble in class while the teacher was giving the lesson.

Some of the boys were pushing some little kids around.

Some of the girls were making fun of a first grade boy for being so little.

Some of the boys were throwing stones at cars passing the school yard.

Some of the girls were being praised by the teacher for writing the best papers in class.

Some boys were helping a small girl who fell off the slide.

Some students were chosen to help the teacher.

A child's name of every ethnic group was presented with each question. In the question about some of the girls wearing dirty clothes, the statement was followed with: "Did Jane have on dirty clothes? Did Maria have on dirty clothes? Did Pearl have on dirty clothes? In the statement about some boys throwing stones, the statement was followed by the questions:

Was Juan throwing stones? Was Scott throwing stones? Was Willie throwing stones? The order of presentation of the child's name after the question was randomized to overcome problems of a possible response set occurring. Scores were coded 1 for a yes response and 0 for a no response and then summed.

The scale, attitudes toward own ethnic group, is composed of students response to the male and female picture of the child of their own ethnic group. The range of the own ethnic group scale is 0 to 9, high score indicating a positive attitude toward their own ethnic group. Attitudes toward other ethnic groups is composed of the students response to pictures of children of the other two ethnic groups. Scores range from 0 to 18, high score again indicating a very positive attitude toward members of other ethnic groups. Table 1 presents the factor analysis for each picture.

-----  
Table 1 about here  
-----

#### Analysis

##### *Peer Group Contextual Factors*

The percent Anglo and the socioeconomic status of the student population are prerequisites for the success of the policy of desegregation defined in terms of its goal of assimilation. "Many proponents of desegregation argue that as long as the black students in a given classroom are in a minority, majority white influence will prevail, thus changing the achievement-related conduct, the beliefs and the values of the black children in the class" (Gerard and Miller 1975:17). In terms of our past research we have found that a high socioeconomic status environment is one which is characterized by a high level of status differences between Anglo

and Hispanic students (Iadicola and Moore, 1979). Specifically, we found that the relationship was only present for the Hispanic female and not the Hispanic male sample. What is now necessary is to verify these factors as assimilatory prerequisites. What is the relationship between percent Anglo and socioeconomic status of the school student population and the level of assimilation Hispanic students achieve in school.

-----  
Table 2 about here  
-----

Generally, the peer group contextual factors do serve as an important mechanism for the accomplishment of assimilation. As one increased the percent Anglo and the socioeconomic status of the school, there is a lower level of favorable attitudes toward ones own ethnic group,  $-.31$  and  $-.44$  ( $p \leq .001$ ) and more favorable attitudes toward the outgroup,  $.23$  and  $.26$  ( $p \leq .01$ ) respectively. This is the case for the Hispanic sample as a whole, as well as the Hispanic male subsample,  $-.30$  and  $-.38$  ( $p \leq .01$ ) and  $.23$  ( $p \leq .05$ ) and  $.31$  ( $p \leq .01$ ) respectively. For the Hispanic female subsample the correlations are only statistically significant for attitudes toward ones own ethnic group,  $-.31$  ( $p \leq .05$ ) and  $-.52$  ( $p \leq .001$ ); however the same pattern of relationships is present for attitudes toward other ethnic groups. There were no significant correlations between the peer group contextual factors and ethnic salience for the Hispanic sample as a whole, nor for the specific subsamples.

#### *Resegregation Processes*

The resegregation processes are generally found to be highly significant correlates of status inequality between Anglo and Hispanic students. This is especially the case for the Hispanic female where all the resegregation processes except one, classroom competition, were significantly correlated with

status differences. For the Hispanic male only classroom competition was a statistically significant correlate of status differences. The question now posed is what is the relationship between these same re-segregation processes and the assimilation of the Hispanic students.

-----  
Table 3 about here  
-----

In terms of the Hispanic sample as a whole, all resegregation processes are significantly correlated with at least one of the indicators of assimilation in the same pattern as was present for the peer group contextual factors. The greater the level of norm referenced testing, the lower the level of ethnic salience,  $-.33 (p \leq .001)$  and the more negative are attitudes toward ones own ethnic group,  $-.17 (p \leq .05)$ . The relationship of grouping practices and assimilation followed a similar pattern. The more classroom grouping, the lower the level of ethnic salience,  $-.21 (p \leq .01)$ , and more negative attitudes toward own ethnic group,  $-.26 (p \leq .01)$ .

The more classroom competition in the school, the more negative attitudes toward ones own ethnic group,  $-.26 (p \leq .01)$  and the more positive attitudes toward the outgroup,  $.27 (p \leq .01)$ . The more absolute and relative difference levels of busing, the more negative attitudes toward own ethnic group,  $-.36$  and  $-.37 (p \leq .001)$  respectively. There are no significant relationships between busing and ethnic salience or busing and attitudes toward the outgroup.

Sex differences are present in the relationship between resegregation processes and assimilation. As the level of grouping and testing increases, the lower the level of ethnic salience for Hispanic males,  $-.25 (p \leq .05)$  and  $-.50 (p \leq .001)$ , respectively. For female students, the higher the level of grouping in school, the more negative attitudes toward own ethnic group,  $-.37 (p \leq .01)$ . Classroom competition, on the other hand, is uniformly correlated

with the indicators of assimilation for Hispanic female students. The higher the level of classroom competition in the school, the lower the level of ethnic salience,  $-.28$  ( $p \leq .05$ ), the more negative attitudes toward own ethnic group,  $-.38$  ( $p \leq .01$ ), and the more positive attitudes toward the outgroup,  $.35$  ( $p \leq .01$ ). This pattern was not as consistent for the Hispanic male. The relationships between busing, both absolute and differences, and the indicators of assimilation follow a similar pattern for the male and female subsamples with the exception that the relationships are stronger for the female sample. The higher the level of Hispanic busing in school, both absolutely and relatively, the more negative attitudes toward own ethnic group,  $-.28$  ( $p \leq .05$ ) and  $-.31$  ( $p \leq .01$ ) for Hispanic males and  $-.48$  and  $-.47$  ( $p \leq .001$ ) for Hispanic females.

#### *Multicultural Modeling Processes*

Generally, the multicultural modeling processes are only statistically significantly correlated with ethnic salience and attitudes toward own ethnic group. The direction of the relationships are the same as found earlier in the case of peer group contextual factors and the resegregation processes. The greater the level of Hispanic multicultural curriculum,  $.29$  ( $p \leq .001$ ) resources,  $.24$  ( $p \leq .01$ ) and staff and parent influence,  $.23$  and  $.26$  ( $p \leq .01$ ), the higher the level of ethnic salience. The greater the Hispanic staff and parent influence relative to Anglo influence, the more positive Hispanic student's attitudes toward their own ethnic group. Conversely, the greater the level of Anglo staff,  $-.25$  ( $p \leq .01$ ) and parent influence,  $-.41$  ( $p \leq .001$ ), relative to Hispanic influence the more negative Hispanic students attitudes are toward their own ethnic group. The pattern is basically the same for the Hispanic male and females analyzed separately, with the exception that again the relationships are stronger in the case of the Hispanic females.

### Conclusion

Before discussing the implications of these findings, I would first like to remind the reader of the necessary limitations of this research. First, given the small sample of schools, ten schools, one must be cautious as to the generalizability of these findings. Also, as a result of the small sample and the high correlations between school factors, partitioning of the variance for testing the degree to which relationships may be spurious is not possible. Therefore, replications of these findings on a larger sample of schools is necessary before any firm conclusions can be reached. Nevertheless, the findings point to some important research leads and also some possible implications for policymakers.

In reviewing the relationships between school characteristics and the indicators of assimilation, there is a consistent pattern. As we manipulate the school environment in order to achieve equal status relations between Anglo and minority students, we appear to be losing the school's ability to control culturally divergent populations through assimilation. This is especially the case with ethnic salience and attitudes toward own ethnic group and not with attitude toward other ethnic groups. The question arises as to whether status inequality is a prerequisite for assimilation. In a previous analysis of this relationship (Iadicola 1979b), the indicators of assimilation were not found to be significantly correlated with status inequality. It may be that status inequality and assimilation are orthogonal manifestations of social control, or possibly, the indicators of either assimilation or status inequality are not sensitive enough to exhibit a relationship between the two sets of factors. Nevertheless, the conditions which are conducive to the reduction of status differences appear to be counter productive to achievement of the goal of assimilation. This, again, is the dilemma of school desegregation. It appears that both goals of desegregation; assimilation and improvement in intergroup relations through the reduction

of prejudice by means of equal status contacts, cannot be achieved within the same institutional environment.

The question then put forward is whether it is possible to achieve improvement in intergroup relations through assimilation. Note, however, that through assimilation one attempts to extinguish the differences which generate conflict between individuals. In terms of this strategy one is accomplishing improvement in relations among individuals and not groups. Nevertheless, this is a strategy to both assimilate minorities and to improve relations between those of Hispanic heritage and the white assimilated, Anglo majority.

Politically, in some communities this may not be a viable strategy. Different minority groups have expressed various concerns regarding the policy of desegregation in terms of its goal of assimilation. Over 95% of the Asian population with school age children in the Chinatown district in 1971 boycotted desegregated schools (Jung, 1972). Asian parents expressed concern about their children being unable to attend after-school Chinese language schools if they were bused long distances for racial balance. Over 1,500 Chinese-American students attended four private "freedom schools" while on boycott (Newsweek, 1971).

There has also been reaction from the Mexican-American community over assimilationist policies. In the case of Riverside, California, the strongest opposition to desegregation came from the Mexican-American community. The elementary school in the Casa Blanca section of Riverside was the center of the Mexican-American community. It served the community as a school as well as an intermediary for relations with the outside community. "More than a school, it seemed almost as a kind of white American consulate to the people of Casa Blanca" (Hendrick, 1968, p. 41). The push for desegregation in Riverside came principally from the Black

community. Black students, at the time of desegregation, composed 6.5 percent of the schools' enrollment, while Mexican-American students composed 10.7 percent. Those Mexican-American leaders involved in the boycott efforts were predominantly from outside the Casa Blanca community. Hendrick observed that "there was a real problem of support for integration among the Mexican Americans in a community already possessing a clear cultural identity" (Hendrick, 1968, p. 146). Petitions within the Casa Blanca community were circulated by Mexican-American parents in opposition to the closing of the community school. Both petitions, together, produced about 190 signatures, mostly from the parents of at least 300 children attending Casa Blanca Elementary School.

The school board appointed a committee of Mexican-American and Black parents to work out the problems of integrating the students from the Casa Blanca school. Closing of the school was not the issue. It had already been decided that the school was to be closed. The Casa Blanca community appeared relatively powerless; the momentum was against them. The leader and spokesman of the community, the principal of the school, was powerless to act. Middle class Mexican-American elites from outside the community, together with middle class black leaders and the school board, appeared to be in control of the politics of the situation. There was little organized opposition from the Anglo community. One year after desegregation had been started in Riverside, Casa Blanca Elementary School was closed.

The Mexican-American community expressed its dissatisfaction with desegregation one last time during the special election in 1966 for the tax override to finance school costs. The tax override proposition lost miserably, 42 percent in favor, 58 percent opposed. Casa Blanca, the largest Mexican-American community in the city, and the Lowell district,

which contains the second largest Mexican-American school population, turned down the tax override, with 38 percent and 48 percent positive votes, respectively. The tax override passed the second time, in 1967, with a vote of 50.7 percent in favor. The Casa Blanca district voted in favor of the override this time. However, during the 1966 election, 505 votes were cast. In 1967, only 231 votes were cast from the two precincts embracing Casa Blanca and parts of the Washington attendance area (Hendrick, 1968). Hendrick feels that the most apparent reason for the low turnout was that the Mexican-American population in Casa Blanca in 1966 was in a quiet way expressing displeasure over the closing of Casa Blanca school. Those still opposed to the closing were not motivated to strike another retaliatory blow at the school district (Hendrick, 1968).

In other communities, there have been demands from Mexican-American student groups for more Mexican cultural representation in the curriculum and staffing of the school. In Los Angeles in 1968, 12,000 students in five predominantly Mexican-American high schools called a boycott to protest just this cultural exclusion from their school (Weinberg, 1977). Smith and Foley (1978) discuss a case of a small town in Texas, Aztlan City, population 10,000. A radical faction of the Mexican-American student body gained control of the schools through boycotts and political action in the city council. Smith and Foley note that once Mayo-CU control was established, the goals of the school were changed. "Cultural transmissions through new curriculum, classroom and community activities, co-curricular events, and a comprehensive new philosophy of bilingual/bicultural education were to create a new social being--a 'chicano view' of the self and society" (Smith and Foley, 1978, p. 158). The political factions in the Mexican-American community represented both the emergent conflict and the liberal order intellectual positions on the issuing desegregation. The

liberal order faction viewed acculturation and assimilation as necessary and desirable in order to attain full citizenship rights and economic opportunities. The conflict position viewed the liberal order faction as proposing the continuation of a policy of colonization of the Mexican-American community by the dominant Anglo society.

This debate over the goals of desegregation and the conflict over the control of the educational institution is sure to increase in the near future. As minority populations increasingly organize and become politically more aware, they will begin to question the intellectual foundation of the policy of desegregation. In many communities where desegregation is an issue there is the development of groups purporting this third intellectual/ideological position, the conflict position. No longer will the debate be defined only in terms of conservative/order, those who are proposing voluntarism and are perceived as restricting educational opportunity, and in terms of the liberal/order perspective, those who wish to move towards equal educational opportunity through assimilation and an integrated society. The conflict conception of the problem, although not represented in the court room debates, will be present in the community where there is a growing concern among minority populations for the preservation of cultural distinctiveness and controlling the formal socialization of the neophytes of their status group. The outcome of this conflict will be determined by the ability of one side to control the definition of the problem as either a case of voluntarism, equal educational opportunity, or cultural imperialism, and to persuade those concerned that they have the solution to the problem; freedom of choice and maintenance of the status quo, desegregation/integration, or community control over schooling especially in the minority communities.

Table 1  
 Factor Analysis of Ethnic Picture for the Entire Sample (313)  
 Analyzed separately by sex and ethnicity of picture.

| Questions                       | Ethnic Female Pictures<br>(Jane, Maria, Pearl) |       |       |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|
|                                 | Hispanic                                       | Anglo | Black |
| Girls wore dirty clothes        | -.31                                           | -.25  | -.42  |
| Girls helping a smaller kid     | .27                                            | .18   | .24   |
| Girls causing trouble           | -.26                                           | -.38  | -.33  |
| Girls making fun of little kid  | -.23                                           | -.23  | -.31  |
| Girls being praised             | .52                                            | .53   | .41   |
| Students chosen to help teacher | .27                                            | .41   | .30   |

| Questions                | Ethnic Male Picture<br>(Scott, Juan, Willie) |       |       |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-------|-------|
|                          | Hispanic                                     | Anglo | Black |
| Boys pushing little kids | .42                                          | .65   | .64   |
| Boys throwing stones     | .44                                          | .39   | .44   |
| Boys helping small girl  | -.46                                         | -.41  | -.30  |

Table 2  
Correlations between Peer Group Contextual Factors and  
Levels of Assimilation for Hispanic 6th Grade Students

| Peer Contextual<br>Factors            | Total Hispanic Sample<br>Indicators of Assimilation |                            |                              | Hispanic Males<br>Indicators of Assimilation |                            |                              | Hispanic Females<br>Indicators of Assimilation |                            |                              | $\bar{X}$ | SD    | N  |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|-------|----|
|                                       | Ethnic<br>Salience                                  | Own<br>Ethnic<br>Attitudes | Other<br>Ethnic<br>Attitudes | Ethnic<br>Salience                           | Own<br>Ethnic<br>Attitudes | Other<br>Ethnic<br>Attitudes | Ethnic<br>Salience                             | Own<br>Ethnic<br>Attitudes | Other<br>Ethnic<br>Attitudes |           |       |    |
| Percent Anglo of<br>the School        | .09                                                 | -.31***                    | .23**                        | .20                                          | -.30**                     | .23*                         | -.01                                           | -.31*                      | .19                          | 44.71     | 9.20  | 10 |
| Socioeconomic Status<br>of the School | -.13                                                | -.44***                    | .26**                        | -.04                                         | -.38**                     | .31**                        | -.21                                           | -.52***                    | .19                          | 55.30     | 22.65 | 10 |
| $\bar{X}$                             | 2.17                                                | 5.32                       | 10.03                        | 1.98                                         | 5.38                       | 9.42                         | 2.36                                           | 5.26                       | 10.72                        |           |       |    |
| SD                                    | 3.61                                                | 1.78                       | 2.80                         | 3.40                                         | 1.96                       | 2.48                         | 3.83                                           | 1.56                       | 3.00                         |           |       |    |
| N                                     | 118                                                 | 100                        | 100                          | 60                                           | 53                         | 53                           | 58                                             | 47                         | 47                           |           |       |    |

\* Significant at the .05 level  
\*\* Significant at the .01 level  
\*\*\* Significant at the .001 level

Table 3

Correlations between Resegregation Processes and Levels of  
Assimilation of Hispanic 6th grade students

| Resegregation<br>Processes                       | Total Hispanic Sample<br>Indicators of Assimilation |                            |                              | Hispanic Males<br>Indicators of Assimilation |                            |                              | Hispanic Females<br>Indicators of Assimilation |                            |                              | $\bar{X}$ | SD     | N  |
|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|--------|----|
|                                                  | Ethnic<br>Salience                                  | Own<br>Ethnic<br>Attitudes | Other<br>Ethnic<br>Attitudes | Ethnic<br>Salience                           | Own<br>Ethnic<br>Attitudes | Other<br>Ethnic<br>Attitudes | Ethnic<br>Salience                             | Own<br>Ethnic<br>Attitudes | Other<br>Ethnic<br>Attitudes |           |        |    |
| Testing                                          | -.33***                                             | -.17*                      | .11                          | -.50***                                      | -.21                       | .00                          | -.18                                           | -.13                       | .19                          | 92.80     | 32.37  | 10 |
| Grouping                                         | -.21**                                              | -.26**                     | -.05                         | -.25*                                        | -.18                       | .09                          | -.18                                           | -.37**                     | -.19                         | 4.08      | 1.37   | 10 |
| Competition                                      | .04                                                 | -.26**                     | .27**                        | .23*                                         | .19                        | .26*                         | -.28*                                          | -.38**                     | .35**                        | 5.25      | .47    | 10 |
| Hispanic Busing                                  | -.12                                                | -.36***                    | .11                          | -.16                                         | -.28*                      | .12                          | -.08                                           | -.48***                    | .09                          | 588.60    | 905.16 | 10 |
| Busing Differences<br>(Hispanic-Anglo)           | -.11                                                | -.37***                    | .11                          | -.12                                         | -.31**                     | .17                          | .11                                            | -.47***                    | .03                          | 388.40    | 826.00 | 10 |
| <u>Multicultural Modeling Processes</u>          |                                                     |                            |                              |                                              |                            |                              |                                                |                            |                              |           |        |    |
| Multicultural Curriculum                         | .29***                                              | -.08                       | .12                          | .19                                          | -.17                       | .08                          | .39**                                          | .05                        | .14                          | 25.9      | 4.12   | 10 |
| Hispanic Resources                               | .24**                                               | .07                        | -.06                         | .26*                                         | -.01                       | -.07                         | .23*                                           | .18                        | -.06                         | 166.32    | 307.13 | 10 |
| Resource Differences<br>(Anglo-Hispanic)         | -.18*                                               | -.03                       | .14                          | -.16                                         | -.01                       | .11                          | -.19                                           | -.08                       | .19                          | -19.00    | 59.07  | 10 |
| Hispanic Staff Influence                         | .23**                                               | .16*                       | .05                          | .21*                                         | .06                        | -.03                         | .25*                                           | .30*                       | .14                          | 11.70     | 9.30   | 10 |
| Staff Influence Differences<br>(Anglo-Hispanic)  | -.17*                                               | -.25**                     | .10                          | -.09                                         | -.18                       | .17                          | -.24                                           | -.35**                     | .00                          | 65.30     | 22.91  | 10 |
| Hispanic Parent Influence                        | .26**                                               | .29**                      | -.13                         | .28*                                         | .23*                       | -.09                         | .25*                                           | .37**                      | -.16                         | 74.8      | 29.16  | 10 |
| Parent Influence Differences<br>(Anglo-Hispanic) | -.21*                                               | -.41***                    | .21*                         | -.23*                                        | -.39**                     | .18                          | -.20                                           | -.46***                    | .21                          | 105.33    | 91.00  | 10 |

- Allport, Gordon  
1954      The Nature of Prejudice. New York: Addison Wesley
- Alsop, Stewart  
1968      "The anti-honky war". Newsweek (December 16) 116.
- Carlson, Robert A.  
1975      The Quest for Conformity: Americanization Through Education.  
New York: Wiley
- Gerard, Harold B.  
and Norman Miller  
1975      School Desegregation: A Long Term Study. New York: Plenum
- Gordon, Milton  
1961      Assimilation in American Life. New York: Oxford University Press
- Henrick, Irving  
1968      The Development of a School Integration Plan in Riverside,  
California: A History and Perspective. Riverside: University  
of California
- Iadicola, Peter  
1977      "Desegregation as a model of assimilation." Paper presented  
at the American Sociological Association Annual Meeting. Chicago
- Iadicola, Peter  
and Helen Moore  
1980      "Multicultural modeling processes and status relations among  
anglo, black and hispanic students in desegregated elementary  
schools." California Sociologist. Volume 3, No. 1, Winter.  
pp. 17-36
- 1979      "The desegregated school and status relations among anglo and  
minority students: The dilemma of school desegregation."  
Paper presented at the American Sociology Association Annual  
Meeting. Boston
- Iadicola, Peter  
1979      Schooling and Social Control: A Presentation of a Weberian  
Conflict Model of the School. Doctoral Dissertation, University  
of California, Riverside
- Innacone, Lawrence  
1977      "Three views on change in educational politics." The Politics  
of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Jung, Raymond K.  
1972      "The chinese language school in the U.S." School and Society,  
100 2342, pp. 304-5
- Mercer, Jane R.,  
Peter Iadicola,  
and Helen Moore  
1980      "Building effective multi-ethnic schools: Evolving models and  
paradigms." in Desegregation: Past, Present and Future. Walter  
G. Stephan and Joe R. Faegin, Editors. New York: Plenum  
pp. 281-307

Moore, Helen and  
Peter Iadicola  
1980

"Resegregation processes and status relationships among anglo hispanic students." Presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, New York

Newsweek  
1971

"San Francisco: boycotting the buses" Volume 27, (12) p.43  
September 27

Smith, W. Elwood  
and Douglas E. Foley  
1978

"Mexicano resistance to schooling in a south texas colony."  
Education and Urban Society. Volume 10, No. 2

Weinberg, Meyer  
1977

A Chance to Learn. New York: Cambridge University Press